things about this issue, which is responding to the outstanding discovery request. 2 Ms. Kane is correct. We did state 3 in our filing that we were prepared to move 4 forward on Issue G and would respond to the 5 discovery request upon the order of Your 6 We stated in there that we were 7 Honor. prepared to respond to those requests within 8 10 days of the order. That is the time for 9 one form of discovery. I think the other one 10 11 has 14 days, but to show good faith, we are 12 going to give them the four days. So I am assuming your order will 13 be out today or tomorrow. So it will be 10 14 15 days from today that we would be doing that. She also said we did not object to 16 the scope of the discovery. That is accurate. 17 18 I just want to make one thing clear, so that nobody is sort of caught off guard. 19 20 While we will be fully responding the questions, it is going to be 21 to all 22 subject to a caveat. We are going to suggest

that a lot of these site based licenses are 1 2 subsumed within geographic licenses, and we believe that, therefore, that sort of moots 3 the issue. 4 5 We can explain all that later, but my point is we are not going to withhold 6 7 discovery on that basis, but we are going to be stating up front as a caveat that we are 8 not, in providing the discovery, conceding 9 10 that issue. 11 Then finally, an issue that I 12 wanted to bring up, because again I don't want this to come as a surprise after the hearing. 13 14 One of the things the Commission requested 15 with a document request were all documents 16 relating to this. JUDGE SIPPEL: The Commission or 17 18 the Bureau? MR. KELLER: The Bureau. 19 I'm 20 That is on of the sorry, the Bureau asked. 21 things in the discovery request, a request for 22 production of documents.

We have documents, at least 12 boxes of documents that are all the documents relating to the facilities. These include construction information, site drawings, leases, all that sort of thing. But as I say, that alone, just those call sign files alone, took up 12 boxes which we managed to get here from Indiana, but it would cost us at least \$8,000 and probably more -- we got an estimate -- to scan in one copy -- you know, just to scan in, have it scanned in for some sort of, I don't know. It would cost much more than that to make multiple paper copies.

My interpretation of the discovery rule is that we are required to make items available for inspection and copying. So what we are going to do is we will make those documents available. We got them to Washington.

They are here in Washington. We will make them available for inspection, but Maritime literally -- I mean absolutely

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	literally does not have the money to make
2	copies and, even if it did, I am not sure that
3	we could expend \$10,000 for something like
4	that without court approval, Bankruptcy Court
5	approval.
6	So we are going to make them
7	available. We have managed to get them here
8	to Washington for that purpose, but we are not
9	equipped to make copies of them.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are they in your
11	offices?
12	MR. KELLER: Right now they are in
13	the office of a copy center in downtown who is
14	holding them for us to wait to see what we are
15	deciding to do. We had them delivered to
16	it is called
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: That is okay. You
18	don't have to tell me exactly. Let me just
19	ask you this, both counsel. If those
20	documents were in your custody, in your firm's
21	custody, you have a conference room of some

kind?

1	MR. KELLER: Well, not that we can
2	That is why we took them to the copy
3	center, because it is a huge amount of
4	documents, and we put them there, figuring
5	that way, if people want to make copies, they
6	are right there at the copy center.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see.
8	MR. KELLER: They are in like a
9	little room or an office at the copy center.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what kind of
11	a facility do they have that you can examine
12	documents?
13	MR. KELLER: They have the ability
14	to be examined there. There is a couple of
15	desks or something. I mean, I have been in
16	there.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: They do?
18	MR. KELLER: Yes. I have been in
19	there a couple of times to go through them
20	myself.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is it in
22	Washington, D.C.?

1	MR. KELLER: Yes. It is on K
2	Street, I believe.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, how about
4	that? Could you send I don't mean to send
5	an attorney, but is there an attorney or a
6	staff member from your office who could go
7	down there and start looking through these
8	documents?
9	MS. KANE: Well, honestly, if
10	there is a location where we could work to
11	review the documents and determine, if any of
12	them, we needed to be copied, that would be
13	okay with us, Your Honor. But absent having
14	that kind of option, then I see now choice but
15	to have them copied.
16	If there is not a work space for
17	us to review them and not I don't know how
18	this is set up, but obviously, we don't want
19	to be sitting in the middle of a copy center
20	reviewing this information.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I got the
22	impression there were desks. It is over on K

1	Street. Send somebody out when they have
2	lunch just to go down and take a look at the
3	place.
4	MS. KANE: We could do that, Your
5	Honor.
6	MR. KELLER: And we are also I
7	am willing to work with the Bureau on some
8	alternate arrangement. I am not committing to
9	this right now, but it is either possible
10	under proper safeguards and control procedures
11	that we might even be willing to let the
12	Bureau have the documents for a period of time
13	to review them in their own facilities, and
14	then copy them if they want to.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are they Bates
16	stamped or something like that?
17	MR. KELLER: No. Right now they
18	are organized by call sign. We have got
19	documents. Each call sign, a divider, and the
20	documents behind that. So all I am saying is
21	I am willing to cooperate with the Bureau and

work out something on this, but we just do not

1	have the money to copy all these documents.
2	MR. HAVENS: Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is this Mr. Havens?
4	MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: You aren't going to
6	pay for the copying, are you?
7	MR. HAVENS: I might do that.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh? Okay. Let's
9	hear you.
10	MR. HAVENS: Okay. I may pay for
11	the copying, copy up in DC, and in addition,
12	Maritime submitted to the Bureau an affidavit
13	about a half-year ago stating that all the
14	records of the site based licenses when they
15	were sold to MCLM were placed at a certain
16	storage facility near Washington, and Mobex
17	who is the seller of these did not pay the
18	copy place and, therefore, they are
19	withholding the records.
20	So I would I don't want to take
21	time here, but I would discuss that with the
22	Enforcement Bureau and make arrangements to go

1	to that storage facility and obtain those
2	records. Those are not the same records as
3	these 12 boxes that are coming out of Indiana,
4	and those were the essential records.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: You are saying
6	there are additional documents over and above
7	the 12 boxes?
8	MR. HAVENS: Yes.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: and they are
10	relevant to this issue?
11	MR. HAVENS: They are the most
12	relevant. The issue in G is not only whether
13	the stations are operating now or are turned
14	off, but whether they were constructed timely
15	and with the required interconnection and
16	other basic requirements by the construction
17	deadline, which was I don't know well
18	over 10 years ago.
19	Those documents are the ones that
20	MCLM stated in its opposition to my company's
21	petition to deny the renewal application of
22	this WRV 374. They have signed a sworn

1	statement by the person who was in control of
2	those records, their former in-house counsel,
3	Mr. Treadmore, that those documents that
4	contain the information on these stations,
5	whether they were built or not and whether
6	they were operated or not in their critical
7	initial period were placed at a certain
8	storage facility, and then Mobex Instead of
9	the buyer keeping them, they all went to this
10	storage facility, and Mobex dissolved and
11	couldn't pay. So we would like to
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Who is paying
13	Well, who is paying then for the storage?
14	MR. HAVENS: We don't know the
15	actual situation at the storage facility, but
16	my companies would like the opportunity,
17	whether it is a subpoena or voluntary
18	arrangement, to contact the storage facility
19	and, with some authority from Your Honor, to
20	obtain whatever documents they have.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me see if
22	Mr. Keller an shed any light on that.

1 MR. KELLER: Yes. First of all, 2 to clarify, 12 boxes -- In addition to the 12 3 boxes, I may have at least one other box of my own that has some additional information that 4 5 we would produce. Basically, what we are producing here in Washington is all 6 7 documents we have. 8 That is not necessarily all the 9 documents that maybe perhaps existed at one 10 time. However, what Mr. Havens is referring 11 to, I believe the firm was called Iron 12 Mountain or something like that. It was --13 MR. No, it HAVENS: was 14 different name. 15 Well, whatever, MR. KELLER: whatever it is, it is not -- Some of the 16 17 documents were with this company, not all. 18 What I can do, I will clarify that when I 19 respond to the Bureau, tell them exactly. But 20 my understanding is -- and again, I will double check this and clarify it when I 21

the document request.

respond to

22

My

1 understanding is that those documents no longer exist, because after a certain period 2 3 of time that company destroyed them when --MR. HAVENS: We were going to test 4 5 that. 6 MR. KELLER: Right. I understand 7 I understand that, but to the extent 8 that the documents are -- Assuming, for the 9 sake of argument, that it was determined that 10 the documents are still available at Iron 11 Mountain or whatever the company is, without 12 having checked with my client in advance, I 13 could say we would have no problem allowing 14 inspection of those documents, subject to the 15 protective order in this case; because I 16 believe some of those documents go to other 17 issues like payments and financings and things like that. 18 MR. HAVENS: The documents that I 19 20 am talking about, if I am recalling exactly 21 Maritime stated, they are not

Maritime's control. The declaration stated

that, when Mobex bought those site based stations, all of the ones in Issue G, it elected not to keep the documents on the stations it was purchasing and the licenses. They remained with the seller, Mobex, and Mobex placed them at this storage facility.

So we want to go directly to the storage facility. We don't want to get, and we would see no basis to get, MCLM approval or disapproval of that, based on the MCLM statement that it didn't take possession of the documents. But in any case, in this discovery process we want some time to go to third parties and examine the depositions, document requests and see what they have, particularly where MCLM has stated itself under oath that it placed the essential documents at this facility.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I think the first order of business would be to find out - somebody to contact the facility and find out if these documents actually do exist

1	there. I don't know what the best way to
2	proceed on that is, but I am sure that
3	somebody can figure that out.
4	MR. KELLER: I would agree, Your
5	Honor. There is nothing to stop them from
6	talking to any third parties about documents
7	that he wants. We don't need a discovery
8	order to obtain information from nonparties.
9	MR. HAVENS: We want the discovery
10	in order to dispose persons
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I know why you
12	want it. I am saying that I am not going to
13	issue an order to produce documents that don't
14	exist anymore.
15	MS. KANE: Your Honor, maybe it
16	would be helpful if Mr. Keller would identify
17	exactly who has these documents or who may
18	have these documents. It sounds like there
19	might be some confusion as to which company
20	has these documents. If Mr. Keller could
21	undertake the investigation to determine where

these documents may be and who we should

1	contact, we will be happy to do so.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just find out who
3	in Maritime would have information on this,
4	relevant information, and find out as soon as
5	you can.
6	MS. KANE: Now with regard to Mr.
7	Keller's option of making the documents
8	available to the Bureau for us to review here,
9	if that is still an option, we would obviously
10	prefer that option than to have to have people
11	working at an off-site location, which is
12	still sort of
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: But Mr. Havens was
14	talking about making copies and paying for
15	them.
16	MS. KANE: Well, for himself, Your
17	Honor. He is entitled to He asked for the
18	same discovery we did. So he is entitled to
19	his own working set of those documents, much
20	like the Enforcement Bureau is.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I heard You
22	didn't say this, Mr. Havens, but I got the

impression you were talking about making multiple copies so that the Bureau would be 2 3 able to also --Well, I would send 4 MR. HAVENS: 5 someone there to see the quantity of documents and try to arrange a cost effective copying 6 7 and, depending on the price, given the cost, 8 I'm sure you all know, of time and legal and 9 everything else, and opportunity passing -- I 10 mean, there is a lot -- These site based 11 stations are blocking my companies nationwide. We are losing opportunities, profit and 12 nonprofit. 13 14 So, yes, it would make sense for 15 me to probably pay for the copying, but if I find a warehouse full of documents that are 16 17 irrelevant and trying to fish through them and 18 find a needle in the haystack, then that may 19 not be worth copying. We would have to take 20 a look. I am talking about 21 JUDGE SIPPEL: the 12 documents. I am trying to help the 22

Bureau facilitate things for the parties that really are interested in these documents. You are, obviously. Correct?

MR. HAVENS: One thing, Your Honor, you know, I am not an attorney. I have been through litigation. I have seen parties produce documents or their staff might have made a mistake or whatever -- whatever it is, I have seen parties produce documents that are not responsive, and you really have to work to find things.

So I don't want to come in here and offend anyone if I say I will pay for the copies for the Enforcement Bureau and then go down there or send somebody down there and find out these don't appear that relevant, and I might be wasting the money. But I am ready to send somebody down there, review them, if it is permitted. I assume these are not confidential or highly confidential. They are all records of Commission licenses and purported legal operations.

1 So anyway, I will send somebody 2 down there as soon as I am told where they 3 are, and take a look, and then I will get with the Bureau and see if we can cover the cost. 4 5 MR. KELLER: Let me just also state an option here. Obviously, Mr. Havens 6 will have to decide what he wants to do. 7 8 The quite that I have cited of six 9 to eight thousand dollars was what they 10 thought it was going to cost to scan all those 11 documents in for us, so that we would then 12 have an electronic copy. In the process of 13 doing that, they would be able to electronically add some kind of Bates serial 14 15 numbering to the documents as well. 16 would then be possible to 17 electronically distribute the documents to 18 everybody, but again we don't have the six to 19 eight thousand dollars to do that. 20 number one. 21 Number two, as to those 12 boxes, 22 there is nothing in there that we are going to

T

2 mentioned, I maybe have another box or so of documents in my office. Some of those 3 documents, we may be seeking confidentiality 4 on, but to that extent, I can copy those, 5 those limited number of documents. 6 Finally, as to what shape the 7 documents are in or whether they are relevant, 8 the Bureau's discovery -- excuse me, the joint 9 discovery request of Mr. Havens and the 10 Bureau was very broad. They basically wanted 11 all documents relevant to the construction, 12 13 operation, blah-blah-blah. So, basically, I have made no 14 effort to weed out things, and the only 15 organization we have done is to divide them by 16 -- We figured the best organization we could 17 do is to line them up by call sign. 18 So you organized the 19 MS. KANE: documents yourself, rather than they are not 20 maintained in the ordinary course of business? 21 22 MR. KANE: No, they

seeking confidentiality on.

1

be

maintained in the ordinary course of business. In fact, Mr. Havens, Skytel previously had access to these documents recently when they were in Indiana for document productions and investigation in connection with the bankruptcy case, and his counsel sat in the same room.

These documents were all in Indiana in some lateral files. They were organized in those files by names. I mean, they know their facilities by names like World Trade Center or Philadelphia or something like that, and I just asked them to go through and add -- as they put these in boxes, to add dividers that identified the call sign for each document.

You know, we here talk in terms of call signs as we are going through, but beyond that, I examined them enough to determine that there is nothing there that we are going to seek confidentiality on, because they are all just sort of routine business operations.

1	Now in addition, I have some
2	documents in my possession that are more of a
3	financial nature, and I will have to determine
4	whether any of those are subject to
5	confidentiality. But if they are, I will take
6	care of making the copies of those, because it
7	is a limited number.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: When can you have
9	that done from your office, from the set in
10	your office? How long is that
11	MR. KELLER: As I said, I was
12	prepared to do all of this within 10 days of
13	today, because that would be part of the
14	production. Anything that I am going to
15	physically copy and produce will be at least
16	within 10 days of today.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Would you prepare a
18	proposed order and send it to me today or
19	tomorrow morning?
20	MS. KANE: Yes, Your Honor.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: To the extent that
22	you can, coordinate it with Mr. Keller. That

1	would facilitate things for me immensely, and
2	I don't want something an order that is
3	going to be objected to, because it is
4	something or something or something. And of
5	course, everything is subject to
6	confidentiality, but if documents meet that
7	criteria. Okay.
8	That is a tall order, but I am
9	going to leave the rest of it up to the
10	attorneys to figure out what you want to do
11	and how you want to do it.
12	MR. HAVENS: Could I ask, on the
13	issue of cost, does that mean that, if my
14	companies do not meet the cost in this case
15	that we will not get copies?
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we haven't
17	gotten to that yet. Okay? We don't even know
18	whether certain documents exist or not. I am
19	not sure. No, I am not saying Now, look,
20	we are not going to make an issue of that, Mr.
21	Havens, and certainly not today.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. HAVENS: Okay.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: I got the
2	impression that you would be willing to maybe
3	spring for the cost. I pursued that with you
4	to see how far you were willing to take it.
5	Let's leave well enough alone right now,
6	unless Well, I am not going to say anything
7	more, because I am just going to confuse
8	myself and everybody else.
9	MS. KANE: Your Honor, I just want
10	to clarify what it is you would like a
11	prepared order on.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: The order that I
13	said that I was going to need to issue in
14	order to move that discovery forward that you
15	initiated back in was it October?
16	MS. KANE: No, it was December,
17	Your Honor. Not too long ago.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: December. Oh,
19	well, that is not too bad.
20	MR. KELLER: So now you are
21	granting the motion concerning discovery?
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Absolutely,

1	exactly, and subject to the law and the
2	discovery proceed in accordance with
3	discussions today, and that at least the
4	initial wave of documents be produced in 10
5	days.
6	MR. PLACHE: Your Honor, it sounds
7	as if there is only one copy of these
8	documents and that they are not Bates stamped.
9	There is no table of contents, and there's no
10	Bates stamps. With this many documents, it
11	would be good to have them at least Bates
12	stamped.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: I agree. I agree.
14	MR. PLACHE: So then we can all
15	know we are working from the same set of
16	documents.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am very squirmy
18	about that, and that is why I said I want them
19	under Mr. Keller's control in being examined.
20	That is what he proposed in the first
21	instance. At least, that gets it started.
22	MR. PLACHE: As long as they are

1	under Mr. Keller's control and he is
2	responsible, but when others start to go
3	through them, if something gets lost or torn -
4	-
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand.
6	MR. PLACE: displaced or out of
7	order, you know, when it gets returned, then
8	MR. HAVENS: Can't MCLM Bates
9	stamp the documents?
LO	MR. KELLER: Again, that is a very
L1	time consuming and expensive undertaking.
L2	What I was saying, the scanning
.3	MR. HAVENS: You mean in the
L4	hearing, whenever you have to expend cost, it
.5	is not possible?
L6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Look, Mr. Havens,
L7	we are talking about We haven't been
L 8	talking a hearing. We are talking about just
L9	discovery, and we are doing the best we can
20	with what we have.
21	MR. KELLER: What I am saying is
22	the most efficient method, to Bates stamping